

DENIED

BY ORDER OF THE COURT

NOTE: CHANGES MADE BY THE COURT

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *ex rel.*,
SHELBY EIDSON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AURORA LAS ENCINAS, LLC,
LINDA PARKS, SIGNATURE
HEALTHCARE SERVICES, LLC, and
DOES 1 through 10, jointly and
severally,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:10-cv-1031 JAK (RZx)
(Hon. John A. Kronstadt)

**FILED PROVISIONALLY UNDER
SEAL**

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT
LINDA PARKS' APPLICATION TO
FILE DECLARATION OF PATRIC
HOOPER AND EXHIBITS IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION OF LINDA
PARKS TO DISMISS UNDER SEAL**

(Dkt. 301)

Date: April 1, 2013
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 750

On March 18, 2013, the *Ex Parte* Application of Defendant LINDA PARKS to file under seal Defendant's Declaration of Patric Hooper in Support of Motion of Defendant Linda Parks to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Defendant Linda Parks' Index of Exhibits in Support of Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, came on for hearing before the Honorable John A. Kronstadt. The Court

1 having fully considered the moving papers, hereby Orders:

2 Defendant's Declaration of Patric Hooper in Support of Motion of Defendant
3 Linda Parks to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure, and Defendant Linda Parks' Index of Exhibits in Support of Motion to
5 Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall
6 not be filed under seal pursuant to Local Rule 79-5.1.

7 The underlying document and application to seal shall be returned and not
8 filed under seal. There is no explanation as to the sensitivity of any of the exhibits
9 identified in the Declaration of Patric Hooper. Moreover, among the exhibits as to
10 which a sealing order is sought, are public documents, e.g., Exhibit E (a Los
11 Angeles Times story); Exhibit K (a Los Angeles Times story); Exhibit M (publicly
12 filed Complaint from Los Angeles Superior Court); Exhibit N (a Los Angeles Times
13 story) and; Exhibit O (publicly filed Complaint from Los Angeles Superior Court).
14 Counsel may re-file the application however any future request shall identify the
15 basis for the requested confidentiality. Otherwise, counsel shall file any exhibits to
16 in support of its Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 300) no later than January 7, 2013.

17
18 DATED: January 2, 2013



Hon. John A. Kronstadt
United States District Judge

DENIED
BY ORDER OF THE COURT